

**MCR Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Taskforce
Questions Re: Taskforce Operations**

The Regulatory Workgroup (i.e., Corps, EPA, OR DEQ, OR DLCD, and WA DOE – Water Quality & Coastal Zone) continues to be interested in your feedback regarding taskforce operations. A few individuals provided feedback on the first taskforce meeting, but we would greatly appreciate additional feedback from other participants. If you have input to share, then please complete the following questionnaire with responses directed to the Corps of Engineers. Alternatively, you can bring your completed questionnaire to the next taskforce meeting. Thank you for your time.

(1) Most feedback at the first taskforce meeting seemed to indicate a preference for more informal meetings. We would like to confirm that this is the preference of the overall taskforce. Should the overall format for taskforce meetings be:

- (a) less formal (e.g. roundtable),**
- (b) more formal, _____**
- (c) continue as at the first meeting? _____**

Please explain:

Roundtable format, with participation by all.

The regulatory workgroup should provide adequate information to the taskforce prior to the meeting via e-mail or snail mail, so as to allow the taskforce adequate time to review the data, discuss issues, and prepare comments, and concerns, etc. There should be no surprises at the meeting. The agenda should be outlined prior to the meeting with an opportunity for response as to other issues and concerns members would like to see added (CRCFA).

In the format of the last meeting, the group was not free to engage in open discussions. The process was somewhat stifling. And no one could see each other, so it was not supportive of useful discussions. A round table would be an improvement. If the plan is to get down to the business of developing our options for studying and managing the sites, we need to talk more openly and relaxed. The current format is too confrontational, even though that is not the intention. I appreciate the need to facilitate (control) the discussion so it stays on track, but a little less structure would be more productive (ODFW).

The first meeting was “informal” because there is no minutes or meeting record. However, I believe that the seating structure was not conducive to productive activity. A roundtable seating structure would be better. Furthermore, it was difficult for members of the taskforce to give relevant input when they had to wait to be recognized by the Corps or EPA, who were not quick to recognize individuals wishing to speak. In addition, I would like future meetings to be recorded. The suggestion of video taping the meetings was a good one and I think everyone could agree that an accurate, unbiased record could be achieved this way for very little cost (CREST).

I would prefer a seating arrangement where we all could see each other. A more "formal" structure could be designed to allow speakers to share views and interact without facilitation by employees of EPA or the Corps between each exchange. I believe this would enhance communication among the taskforce (Huhtala).

The seating arrangement of the first taskforce meeting set a confrontational atmosphere even before the meeting began. In order to facilitate an atmosphere open to suggestions and inter-agency communication, this must be changed. The way in which taskforce members were allowed to respond was tightly controlled (formal), though there was no official note-taker. I would like to see a discussion-oriented, compromise-receptive, less formal atmosphere in which everyone can see who has a question or comment to make and is allowed to make it in a timely manner (NWEA).

The taskforce should in my opinion be a joint-effort group meeting, and not resemble a sort of "court-session where a panel of experts and judges sits behind tables and others can testify from the room". The sessions should –again in my opinion- be an informal information-and-view-exchange in a working-together atmosphere (Hermans).

I have not attended as many taskforce meetings as I would like -- hope to attend as many as my schedule permits (Richardson).

In the format of the last meeting, the group was not free to engage in open discussions. The process was somewhat stifling. And no one could see each other, so it was not supportive of useful discussions. A round table would be an improvement. If the plan is to get down to the business of developing our options for studying and managing the sites, we need to talk more openly and relaxed. The current format is too confrontational, even though that is not the intention. I appreciate the need to facilitate (control) the discussion so it stays on track, but a little less structure would be more productive (Merems).

(a) (Meyer).

Seems everyone was unhappy with prior format, should give all opportunity to comment, although it needs to be controlled for obvious reasons (Bills).

A more informal structure is much more conducive to an open interchange of information and a roundtable seating arrangement seems to work well for encouraging exchange (Sutherland).

The first meeting was "informal" because there is no minutes or meeting record. However, I believe that the seating structure was not conducive to productive activity. A roundtable seating structure would be better. Furthermore, it was difficult for members of the taskforce to give relevant input when they had to wait to be recognized by the Corps or EPA, who were not quick to recognize individuals wishing to speak. In addition, I would like future meetings to be recorded. The suggestion of video taping

the meetings was a good one and I think everyone could agree that an accurate, unbiased record could be achieved this way for very little cost (Taylor).

I think we would benefit from a seating arrangement that allowed us to sit across from each other—it would allow for more interaction and we could hear each others questions and responses (OFFQUES).

(2) The Regulatory Workgroup will provide the agenda, overheads presented at the meeting and brief summary of the issues addressed. Some members expressed a concern about having formal meeting notes while others seemed to want more informal meetings all around. Please indicate your level of concern about having detailed meeting notes and share any additional ideas you might have on this subject.

All meetings should be videotaped, BOTH the Taskforce and the Regulatory workgroup. Previous meeting notes have been inaccurate and incomplete. Concerns such as Mitigation, size of the deepwater site, size of the buffer, economic analysis, monitoring of Site E have been noted and then circumvented or ignored. Important issues have not been adequately addressed (CRCFA).

I think its important to have documentation at the meetings. Not necessarily word-for-word, but a summary that focuses on specific issues raised by participants, decisions and agreements made and how each participant “votes” on a topic, etc. The meetings can be less formal, but the need for documentation is still necessary. Video taping meetings is done in other groups and is a logical way to track discussions, decisions , etc. if the need arises, and it will. The Corps could hire a temp for a day to record or video tape, much cheaper than a professional facilitator (ODFW).

I would like to see the meeting have a roundtable seating arrangement. I would like everyone in the Taskforce and the Regulatory Workgroup to take turns speaking and listening though one of any number of standard procedures without the need to be formally recognized by a Corps or EPA employee. I would like to have a video and audio record of the meetings. If a dispute arises at a later date regarding what was said or agreed upon at a meeting, it is important to have a record (CREST).

Meeting notes should be taken and circulated. It is essential that the possibility of inaccurate representation of what occurs at the meetings be minimized (e.g. - consensus vrs. conditioned agreement). The idea of video-taping the meetings is excellent, though my first choice would be video plus transcribed minutes (Huhtala).

Past working-group meetings illustrate the need for video/audio recording and these should be employed at the next meeting. I think it is very important that an unbiased record be maintained. I would like to see an effort made by the Corps to produce minutes of the meetings for purposes of the record as well as demonstrating their commitment to this process. Further, minutes from RW meetings would also be appropriate for the taskforce’s review (NWEA).

See answer at question 1. I believe official detailed notes will have a severe negative effect on the meetings. The meetings themselves are (as I understand it) not intended as a formal decision process. Therefore, a short summary of main items of interest/discussion/conclusions,/ etc. would serve perfectly fine (Hermans).

None (Richardson).

I think its important to have documentation at the meetings. Not necessarily word-for-word, but a summary that focuses on specific issues raised by participants, decisions and agreements made and how each participant "votes" on a topic, etc. The meetings can be less formal, but the need for documentation is still necessary. Video taping meetings is done in other groups and is a logical way to track discussions, decisions , etc. if the need arises, and it will. The Corps could hire a temp for a day to record or video tape, much cheaper than a professional facilitator (Merems).

A synopsis will be fine (Meyer).

Don't think we need detailed notes; we could waste a lot of time agreeing on the minutes (Bills).

There should be a good (thorough) record kept of the meetings. In addition, the agenda should be provided well in advance in draft so Task Force members can provide input. Information about issues to be addressed should be sent out in advance to allow members time for preparation and discussion(Sutherland).

I would like to see the meeting have a roundtable seating arrangement. I would like everyone in the Taskforce and the Regulatory Workgroup to take turns speaking and listening though one of any number of standard procedures without the need to be formally recognized by a Corps or EPA employee. I would like to have a video and audio record of the meetings. If a dispute arises at a later date regarding what was said or agreed upon at a meeting, it is important to have a record (Taylor).

Would appreciate a record of what issues were covered at previous meetings but don't think they need to be as detailed as for the siting process. Should also offer an opportunity for taskforce members to accept or decline to accept the meeting minutes as written (means these minutes would have to be provided several days prior to each scheduled meeting) and to note disagreements in minutes (OFFQUES).

(3) The taskforce will meet at least annually. Additional meetings are expected, especially during the first year or two of this process. Please indicate how often you expect you could attend taskforce meetings given your individual situation:

- (a) No more than 2 per year, _____
 - (b) 2-4 meetings per year, _____
 - (c) Other, _____
-

(c) as needed (CRCFA).

(c) Although, initially it may need to be more often than (b) to get things going. I may have difficulty attending more meetings, but could send a proxy, if the support is in place (ODFW).

(c) As many meetings as are useful and productive. I would attend numerous useful and productive meetings with tangible results. I do not have the time to attend meetings that are not useful, not productive, and have tangible results (CREST).

(b) (Huhtala).

I would be happy to go to more than 4 meetings per year, provided the taskforce is given a viable goal. (Meaning, suggestions and concerns of the taskforce would not be selectively dismissed.)(NWEA).

(b) (assuming a few hours –max. half a day- per meeting)(Hermans).

(b) (Richardson).

(b) Although, initially it may need to be more often than (b) to get things going. I may have difficulty attending more meetings, but could send a proxy, if the support is in place (Merems).

(b) (Meyer).

(c) As needed (Bills).

Clearly this should be dependent on the need to discuss issues and provide input (Sutherland).

(c) As many meetings as are useful and productive. I would attend numerous useful and productive meetings with tangible results. I do not have the time to attend meetings that are not useful, not productive, and have tangible results (Taylor).

(b) (OFFQUES).

(4) We did not set a date for the next meeting of the taskforce. The Regulatory Workgroup is now proposing another taskforce meeting in early June so we can discuss primarily the 2000 dredging season (not discussed at the first meeting). If taskforce members would prefer to avoid travelling to Portland for this meeting, then we could distribute and discuss information regarding the 2000 dredging season via e-mail. Any comments or preferences regarding the proposal for a meeting in early June?

June meeting is good – please send material for comment prior to the meeting. Make sure bathymetric surveys are complete and the information available before the meeting (CRCFA).

It really depends on the meeting content. If it does not involve new site designation stuff, I'd be willing to discuss it via email. We could sign up for a email chat room and have a live discussion, or a tele-conference. If a physical meeting is preferred by the group, I can attend. I am unavailable the week of June 12 (ODFW).

I would be willing to attend a June meeting. If the group decides to use e-mail to discuss information, I ask that all participants receive copies of each participant's comments(CREST).

I would prefer face-to-face interaction regarding the 2000 dredging season. In fact, I encourage all possible ways of sharing concerns and ideas. It is essential to move towards building understanding (and ultimately trust in the accountability of the action agencies) (Huhtala).

I'd like to see a meeting scheduled. I think it is important for the taskforce to meet to discuss the material with the Corps/EPA in person, but the material must be provided early enough to provide ample time for review before such a meeting (NWEA).

Travelling to Portland is not an issue for me. Information and feedback via e-mail would be perfect to me too (Hermans).

I will not be able to attend any meeting from June 7th through June 12th(Richardson).

It really depends on the meeting content. If it does not involve new site designation stuff, I'd be willing to discuss it via email. We could sign up for a email chat room and have a live discussion, or a tele-conference. If a physical meeting is preferred by the group, I can attend. I am unavailable the week of June 12 (Merems).

Okay for early June (Meyer).

Think meeting would be worthwhile (Bills).

(Nothing) (Sutherland).

I would be willing to attend a June meeting. If the group decides to use e-mail to discuss information, I ask that all participants receive copies of each participant's comments (Taylor).

I would be available most days in June, except for the week of June 12th. If this is primarily an informational meeting on forecasted dredging amounts and disposal locations for the 2000 dredging season at the MCR, then we could probably discuss

these issues via e-mail. If more detailed discussions are needed, then we should have a group meeting (OFFQUES).

(5) At this time, the Regulatory Workgroup expects that most taskforce meetings will be held in Portland. However, the location of taskforce meetings could alternate if that best serves the taskforce membership. A few taskforce members seemed to be interested in having meetings outside of Portland. Please indicate your preference for taskforce meeting location:

-
- (a) Portland, _____
(b) Other: (please specify below)

Open (CRCFA).

Portland or Astoria are probably the best choices. Portland is only slightly farther than Astoria for me, so I don't have a strong preference. I suggest choosing the location that requires the shortest travel distance for the most participants. I can't see dragging everyone from WA. to Newport, but I would be glad to book the room for it!(ODFW).

My preference would be Astoria, Oregon. However, Longview, Washington might be a good compromise location for both Washington and Oregon personnel. I would be willing to come to Portland if the majority of the group felt that this was the best location (CREST).

Hey, I prefer a coastal location (I live in Astoria); it kind of makes sense, too, since we're discussing ocean-related issues. However, I understand that Portland is most convenient for most agency folks. So... perhaps some meetings could be held in Astoria or Newport? (Huhtala).

(b) I am willing to travel to other meeting locations and would suggest a rotating location schedule, reflective of where taskforce members work. (Newport, Astoria, Longview, Olympia, etc.)(NWEA).

(a) (Hermans).

(b) Astoria, Longview(Richardson).

(b) Portland or Astoria are probably the best choices. Portland is only slightly farther than Astoria for me, so I don't have a strong preference. I suggest choosing the location that requires the shortest travel distance for the most participants. I can't see dragging everyone from WA. to Newport, but I would be glad to book the room for it! (Merems).

(b) Alternating between Portland and Astoria would be ok with me (Meyer).

(a) Could have limited number at Astoria and possible mid distance sites (Bills).

(a) To be fair to those who are always traveling to Portland, meetings could be rotated between Portland, Astoria, and Kelso/Longview.

(b) My preference would be Astoria, Oregon. However, Longview, Washington might be a good compromise location for both Washington and Oregon personnel. I would be willing to come to Portland if the majority of the group felt that this was the best location (Taylor).

If we are going to have more than 2 or 3 meetings per year, I suggest we have at least half of them be on or nearer the coast, i.e., Newport, Seaside, Astoria, Longview, etc.(OFFQUES).

(6) The Regulatory Workgroup wants the taskforce members to be satisfied with how meetings are run and how agenda topics are selected. Would you like to see a taskforce representative selected to assist the Regulatory Workgroup with meeting procedures & agendas? _____

Any volunteers?

Comments?

There is no reason that there cannot be input by all members via a draft agenda open for comment (CRCFA).

I'm not sure this is needed. I know DLCD has Oregon's and the resources best interest in mind. I'd prefer it if there wasn't the two-group separation in the first place. I'd like the RW to circulate agendas for review by all taskforce members. Any volunteers? If the group decides they want this rep, then we should "vote" on who it will be. Sorry I cannot volunteer, I can't afford the time (ODFW).

I would be willing to serve. I would also be satisfied with any one of several other people in this role. I think that the group as a whole should agree on the person to serve in this capacity (CREST).

Great idea, but I can't volunteer. This questionnaire was a good idea, too. Finding ways to share our thoughts with the group between meetings is desirable & this interchange could be used to help formulate agendas (Huhtala).

I would like to see the taskforce agree/vote to have a representative assist the RW with meeting procedures and agendas. Alternatively, the RW's procedures and meeting minutes could be made open for comment via this list, in the same manner as this questionnaire, prior to RW meetings. Policies/Decisions should be made available to the taskforce for review prior to taskforce meetings (NWEA).

No! I think the workgroup is professional and capable to deal with this! Although it's good to be open for suggestions (like you obviously are by sending this questionnaire), including a representative just moves the 'potential problem (?)' to another level.

[Are we going to need representative-elections, who sets the procedures for those and the internal process in the taskforce group, etc.?] Again: I think anything should be done to avoid the idea that this is “them-against-us”-situation, or a situation where the taskforce would have any reason not to trust the workgroup. Therefore, this suggestion would have adverse effects! (Hermans).

The two or three meetings I have attended, there was a feeling of "lack of comfort" with the facilitator. Could some other options be explored? (Richardson).

I'm not sure this is needed. I know DLCD has Oregon's and the resources best interest in mind. I'd prefer it if there wasn't the two-group separation in the first place. I'd like the RW to circulate agendas for review by all taskforce members. If the group decides they want this rep, then we should “vote” on who it will be. Sorry I cannot volunteer, I can't afford the time (Merems).

I don't think that is necessary (Meyer).

No (Bills).

I think a representative is a good idea although I think if agendas are announced enough in advance and members are given an opportunity for input, that would work also (Sutherland).

I would be willing to serve. I would also be satisfied with any one of several other people in this role. I think that the group as a whole should agree on the person to serve in this capacity (Taylor).

Not a big issue with me (OFFQUES).

(7) Some taskforce members expressed concerns about the balance of presentations to group discussions at the first taskforce meeting. Please indicate your preference for:

*(a) more presentations? _____
Of what nature?*

(b) more time for open discussions? _____

(c) other ideas??

(c) Regulatory agencies should present their management and monitoring proposals and draft MOU/MOA PRIOR to the meeting either in e-mail or hard copy format (CRCFA).

(b) (ODFW).

(c) I think that time could be spend productively if members of the Regulatory Workgroup were to update the Taskforce on the status of the agreement between those entities and the relationship to the Taskforce. Written documents should be distributed

by mail or e-mail before the meeting so that everyone has the opportunity to read them before the meeting. It is difficult to know what topics for comments or discussion the Taskforce might have which would have a productive result if the structure and responsibilities of the Regulatory Workgroup and the Taskforce are not clear (CREST).

If we all know the agenda and parameters before the meetings, time can best be spent on focused discussion around specific topics. Some room for more open exchange should be provided (Huhtala).

Without having a clear idea of what the taskforce will be invited/allowed to contribute to the mitigation/monitoring/management/usage of the ODMDs, it's difficult to say which would be more productive. However, updates on agency actions related to the ocean disposal issues as well as the greater channel deepening project could play a role (NWEA).

Perhaps a little bit more structure in the different steps per subject. 1 Presentation > 2 Discussion > 3 Conclusions/closing remarks > 4 Next subject (Hermans).

From the meetings I have attended it feels as if presentation time is heavily weighted in favor of agency presentations. If citizen groups could share more in the presentation process, that might lead to more of a feeling of contribution (Richardson).

Presentations from researchers or academics on related topics that will broaden our views on possible study or mngt. options and aid in decision making (Merems).

(Nothing) (Meyer).

(b) (Bills).

More time for open discussions is more preferable to more presentations (Sutherland).

I think that time could be spend productively if members of the Regulatory Workgroup were to update the Taskforce on the status of the agreement between those entities and the relationship to the Taskforce. Written documents should be distributed by mail or e-mail before the meeting so that everyone has the opportunity to read them before the meeting. It is difficult to know what topics for comments or discussion the Taskforce might have which would have a productive result if the structure and responsibilities of the Regulatory Workgroup and the Taskforce are not clear (Taylor).

(b) (OFFQUES).

(8) Would people prefer that we plan to order in lunches, i.e., either as a working lunch or just to shorten the time needed to get to, order, & eat lunch? (Please note that participants would still have to pay for their own lunches. Financial resources are not available to provide paid lunches.

- (a) Yes, _____
(b) No, _____
-

(b) (CRCFA).

(a) I'd prefer to take a lunch break if we're to meet more than 3 hours (ODFW).

It doesn't matter to me (CREST).

(b) I, for one, like the lunch break (Huhtala).

Use strict (and not too long; f.e. 45 minutes) time limit for lunch. Give people opportunity to order box lunch beforehand so that everyone is able to meet the time limit that way (while still having the freedom/choice to get/arrange their own lunch if wanted)(Hermans).

(a)(Richardson).

(b) I'd prefer to take a lunch break if we're to meet more than 3 hours.

(a) (Meyer).

(b) (Bills).

(b) (Sutherland).

It doesn't matter to me (Taylor).

I prefer having a defined lunch break. If the meeting looked like it was going to go well beyond normal business hours, then it might be appropriate to order lunch in to shorten the meeting (OFFQUES).

(9) Any other questions or comments you would like to share regarding the taskforce?

- Would like to see individual responses to this and all future surveys, agendas, etc.***
- Local governments MUST be part of the Regulatory workgroup (CRCFA).***

In addition to providing the group with an agenda prior to the meetings, I'd like a preview of the material that will be presented or distributed at the meeting, particularly if it is new information or would likely raise issues among group participants. I think this would help us to make better use of our time in the meeting, because we would hopefully have a more educated discussion. If the RW is not comfortable disseminating their information before it is explained, then we should consider having a follow-up opportunity to discuss the presented material if questions arise later.

Thanks for requesting our input on these matters. I think it was a good idea. Surveys may prove useful for other topics too (ODFW).

I would like to see the individual responses of the members of the Taskforce to this survey (CREST).

Thank you for distributing this questionnaire. I cannot overemphasize the value and distributing agendas and presentation information in advance of taskforce meetings. This will allow for appropriate preparation and, hopefully, productive discussion. We're all busy, so let's cut wasted time by sharing information in advance. Thanks again (Huhtala).

In addition to providing the group with an agenda prior to the meetings, I'd like a preview of the material that will be presented or distributed at the meeting, particularly if it is new information or would likely raise issues among group participants. I think this would help us to make better use of our time in the meeting, because we would hopefully have a more educated discussion. If the RW is not comfortable disseminating their information before it is explained, then we should consider having a follow-up opportunity to discuss the presented material if questions arise later. Thanks for requesting our input on these matters. I think it was a good idea. Surveys may prove useful for other topics too (Merems)..

I would like to see the individual responses of the members of the Taskforce to this survey (Taylor).